

**MINUTES OF A
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE
CITY OF CORONADO
Coronado City Hall
1825 Strand Way
Coronado, CA 92118
Tuesday, March 20, 2007**

Mayor Smisek called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL:

Present: Councilmembers Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Mayor Smisek

Absent: None

Also Present: City Manager Mark Ochenduszko
Deputy City Attorney Johanna Canlas
City Clerk Linda Hascup

2. INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE. Deborah Mariya, former Navy Chaplain, provided the invocation and Mayor Smisek led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. MINUTES: Approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 6, 2007, were approved as amended. The reading of the minutes in their entirety was unanimously waived.

MSUC (Monroe/Tanaka) moved that the City Council approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 6, 2007, a copy having been provided Council prior to the meeting, as amended.

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

4. CEREMONIAL PRESENTATIONS:

4a. Proclamation: Chief Paul W. Crook, Jr. Day. Mayor Smisek presented the proclamation to Paul Crook who thanked the City Council and introduced three new police officers.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR: The City Council approved, adopted and/or accepted as one item of business Consent Agenda Items 5a through 5c and Item 5e.

MSUC (Downey/Ovrom) moved that the City Council approve the Consent Calendar Items 5a through 5c and Item 5e.

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

5a. Approval of Reading by Title and Waiver of Reading in Full of Ordinances on this Agenda. The City Council waived the reading of the full text and approved the reading of the title only.

5b. Approval of Warrants. The City Council ratified payment of warrants Nos. 10056711 thru 10057201 audited and approved by the Audit Committee, provided there are sufficient funds on hand. **The City Council approved the warrants.**

5c. Approval of a Request to Donate Two Surplus Kawasaki Police Motorcycles to the City of Chula Vista Police Department for Use in Regional Police Motorcycle Academy. The City of Chula Vista's Police Department holds the regional Police Motorcycle Academy to train police officers from the City of Coronado as well as other jurisdictions. The City of Coronado currently owns two 2002 Kawasaki police motorcycles which have been replaced with new models. In exchange for the donation of the two surplus motorcycles, the City of Chula Vista Police Department will waive any costs associated with Coronado Police Department participation in the 2007 Police Motorcycle Academy. Costs per officer are approximately \$665.00. **The City Council authorized the donation of two surplus Kawasaki police motorcycles to the City of Chula Vista Police Department for use in the newly established regional Police Motorcycle Academy.**

5d. Authorization for the Director of Fire Services to Enter Into and Maintain a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Mutual Aid Firefighting Operations on San Diego Unified Port District Marinas, Piers, Docks, and Other Waterborne Incidents.

Pete Fagan, Coronado resident, said he does not have an objection to the MOU itself, but he does have an objection to the manner in which the staff report was prepared and the recommendations to the City Council. Specifically because the subject MOU involves the City of Coronado, the City of Imperial Beach, as well as some other municipalities and organizations. He pointed out that everyone knows the City of Imperial Beach has asked the City of Coronado to engage in discussions for Coronado to provide firefighting services to Imperial Beach, so there are some

ongoing issues with Imperial Beach in discussion of those matters. He said that the staff report, on page 53, states specifically that the City Attorney has reviewed and approved the MOU. He has a problem with that in that Coronado's city attorney works for the same law firm as the city attorney for the City of Imperial Beach. He wonders whether this is a conflict of interest for the Coronado city attorney to make a recommendation that approves an MOU involving another city with which Coronado is engaging in discussions on contract basis fire services. He asked if the City shouldn't have an independent legal review as opposed to a city attorney who may be conflicted in this case and shouldn't the City Council demand, in all cases, that recommendations brought before its elected officials be unbiased and independent.

Mayor Smisek explained that this has been done for years. The Coronado City Attorney and the firm he works for represent many cities in the San Diego area. Mayor Smisek's assumption is that, in approving and reviewing the MOU, the City Attorney is talking about the legal portions of the MOU and not the substance of the MOU.

City Manager Mark Ochendusko concurred with Mayor Smisek's comments. This is an agreement for cooperation in providing mutual aid services with all the agencies that provide services in the South Bay area. He cannot conceive of a way in which the City Attorney would be advantaged by reviewing and approving the form of this document.

The Deputy City Attorney indicated agreement with the comments of the Mayor and City Manager.

The City Council authorized the Director of Fire Services to enter into and maintain a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Joint Firefighting Operations on San Diego Unified Port District Marinas, Piers, Docks and Other Waterborne Incidents.

5e. Award of Contract for Sewer Replacement and Alley Resurfacing Project - Block 55 (between I and J Avenues from Eighth to Ninth Streets), Block 56 (between J Avenue and Alameda Boulevard from Eighth to Ninth Streets) and Block 95 (between I and J Avenues from Sixth to Seventh Streets). The project was advertised for bidding beginning on February 14, 2007 and bids were publicly opened on March 8, 2007 with the following results:

BIDDER	Base Bid	Corrected Bid	Bid Additive	Total
1. BRH-Garver West	\$421,730.00		\$22,500.00	\$444,230.00
2.Ortiz Corporation	\$505,775.00		\$3,000.00	\$508,775.00
3. Cass Construction	\$509,856.00		\$31,550.00	\$541,506.00
4. S.C. Valley	\$529,600.00		\$20,000.00	\$549,600.00
5. El Cajon Grading	\$546,936.00		\$20,750.00	\$567,686.00
6. Orion Construction	\$631,820.00		\$1,500.00	\$633,320.00
7.Zondiros Corporation	\$626,570.00	\$638,070.00	\$30,000.00	\$668,070.00
8. NCC NEWest	\$626,128.00		\$28,000.00	\$654,128.00
9. Arrieta Construction	\$634,576.46		\$43,882.00	\$678,458.46
10. ARB, Inc.	\$717,502.00		\$15,000.00	\$732,502.00
11. Falon Construction	\$800,300.00		\$10,000.00	\$810,300.00

The engineer's estimate for this project was \$650,000 and the low bid, including the bid additive, was \$444,230. Staff has evaluated BRH-Garver West's bid package, insurance, bonding and construction references and determined the contractor to be "responsive." Contracting laws direct the City to award the contract to the lowest responsive bidder, in this case, BRH-Garver West. **The City Council awarded a contract to BRH-Garver West in the amount of \$444,230 for a base bid of \$421,730 and bid additive of \$22,500 for the construction of the Sewer Replacement and Alley Resurfacing Blocks 55, 56, and 95 project. The Council also authorized the reallocation of \$293,200 from the FY 06/07 CIP Wastewater Master and \$239,900 from the FY 06/07 CIP Right-of-Way Improvement (Alley Repair – General Fund) Plans (previously approved) to project accounts #510781-9862-WWMP55 and #400710-9872-07ROWI55, respectively, for a total of \$533,100.**

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. **Mayor Smisek introduced Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy Wayne Arny** who delivered a letter of support to continue to work in the spirit of the EIS/EIR for a third carrier and to rededicate the Navy and City to a coordinated effort to deal with the impacts of a third carrier.
- b. **Joe Ditler, Executive Director of Coronado Historical Museum,** introduced Jonathan Ford, the Visitor Center Director, who will be addressing the City Council next month in Mr. Ditler's absence. He advised the City Council that the CHA recently received a gift to allow them to purchase an antique Hotel Del laundry truck. He provided copies of the monthly newsletter and introduced the new exhibits and fundraiser.

7. CITY MANAGER:

- 7a. **Update on Council Directed Actions and Citizen Inquiries.** No report.

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

8a. Public Hearing: Approval of a Resolution for a Two-Lot Tentative Parcel Map to Allow for Condominium Ownership of 4 Residential Units at 401-407 E Avenue in the R-3 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone. (PC 3-07 Iwashita, David). Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, provided background information for the agenda item.

Councilmember Downey said she is comfortable with the idea that anyone who damages the alley should pay to fix it.

David Iwashita, applicant, outlined the few issues that were worked on in the Planning Commission hearings.

Mayor Smisek opened the public hearing.

Jan Iwashita, 522 G Avenue, concurred with Mr. Iwashita's comments and added that the Star Pine is lovely and that they really will work to keep it as City staff requested, but her concern is over the long term health of the tree and any liability they might incur.

Mayor Smisek closed the public hearing.

Mr. Tanaka said he had watched the Planning Commission meeting where the Iwasita's talked about how it was a surprise to them that they were going to have to pay for the whole alley. He appreciates the solution they offered – for this and those already in the pipeline that have the same problem the City should pay for the other half. From that point on, that will be the price of doing business. Councilmember Tanaka supports the Planning Commission recommendation as does Councilmember Ovrom.

MSUC (Tanaka/Ovrom) moved that the City Council adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CORONADO APPROVING A TWO LOT TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP FOR DEVELOPMENT OF FOUR CONDOMINIUM UNITS FOR LOTS 21 AND 22, BLOCK 123, MAP 376 CBSI, ADDRESSED AS 401-407 E AVENUE, CORONADO, CA. The Resolution was read by Title, the reading in its entirety unanimously waived and adopted by Council as RESOLUTION NO. 8202. The City Council agreed to amend Condition #13 such that the City would bear 50% of the cost of the alley replacement.

Ms. Downey asked about the cost to the applicant to save the tree. She appreciates the applicants going the extra mile to save the tree. She also asked for clarification on how many applications are in the pipeline. Mr. Pena explained that there were only a few. March 13 is the date being used as a cutoff.

Mayor Smisek asked if the maker and seconder of the motion would be interested having the City pay the other half for this and those in the pipeline. They both agreed.

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

8b. Continued Public Hearing for the Introduction of “An Ordinance of the City of Coronado, California, Amending Subsections B and C of Section 90.10.100 of the Coronado Municipal Code Regarding the Coronado Cays Specific Plan Side Yard Setback Requirements for Detached Single Family Dwellings in the Village Residence Zones” in the Coronado Cays (PC 20-06 City of Coronado).

City Manager Mark Ochendusko advised that he would have to recuse himself and left the dais. Assistant City Manager Jim Benson assumed his seat.

Councilmember Phil Monroe also recused himself. Prior to leaving the dais he rebutted the statement in a letter submitted by Ms. Croshier's letter in which she stated that Mr. Monroe's comments from the last meeting and his actions would circumvent government documents, that

he was an activist for construction and that people were asking for building additions that weren't allowed and that is why the Specific Plan was done. He said the statements are not factually correct, they do not represent his feelings on the action, and they would not be supported by the minutes.

Tony Pena, Director of Community Development, provided background information for the agenda item. He said that at the City Council meeting of February 20th, the City Council reviewed a proposal to amend the Cays Specific Plan dealing with the Egret model, which was part of the Port Royale village development. After a lengthy discussion it became clear that other portions needed to be clarified and the City Council directed staff to add language to Section 90.10.100 to provide clarification. With the help of Councilmember Downey, staff came up with some language that has been reviewed and accepted by the CCHOA. Staff has also, since the last meeting, received phone calls and had meetings with residents.

Councilmember Downey believes the changes meet the Council's request from the previous meeting. Councilmember Tanaka recommended removing the underlined phrase under C.2. on page 88 of the staff report "of the first floor" because he believes it is incorrect. Discussion on this point continued. Ms. Downey feels that the phrase does exactly what the City wants it to. If you aren't referring to the Egret model the comment might be more appropriate.

Mayor Smisek opened the public hearing.

Ralph Longfellow, 28 Catspaw Cape, stated his feeling that City staff is providing the Council with misleading information regarding this requested change. He read the first sentence on the bottom of page 86 of the agenda. "The only proposed change in current policy is the amendment for Egret model, detached single family dwellings in Port Royale Village." He pointed out that Attachment D has a lot of detail on how this would impact Port Royale Village. When people read this they think that they are being asked to only make a change that would affect the Egret models in Port Royale Village. That is incorrect. The section of the Specific Plan in question, paragraph 90.10.100, affects four villages. They are Jamaica, Bahama, Trinidad, and Port Royale. If one examines Attachment A on page 88 and 89 one will find additions and deletions of paragraphs B and C of that section. Those changes affect all four villages. There is a major change to the Specific Plan that is not being mentioned in the background, analysis, or staff recommendation. That change is the strike out of the word "only" as seen in the third paragraph, C.2., page 88. He read from the current, approved Coronado Cays zoning regulations, referred to as the Specific Plan. "Any modification, addition, reconstruction or replacement of a home constructed utilizing the special side yard may be expanded only on the first floor and only within a rectangular area formed by the projection of the outermost walls of the home as constructed by the developer." The words "only on the first floor" are underlined in the code for emphasis. It could be assumed from this that the developer and the City felt it essential and a proper restriction for density control when agreeing on the Special Use Permit. People will tell you that expansions on second floors have been allowed. It is true. They have been allowed by the CCHOA and the City in spite of an ordinance which prohibits them. He has seen them. Most of them are attractive additions. Some are ugly and oversized and even block their neighbor's views. Because of this, what has happened in the past does not mean that it should happen in the future. He urged the City Council to reconsider this proposal until it has information regarding the total impact of all four villages.

David Johnson, Port Royale, commented that he lives in a planned community. Footprints and setbacks were designed for a reason. Beautiful additions have been made routinely over existing garages without changing footprints or setbacks. Even though he believes the existing code allows additions to the first floor, over garage additions could certainly work for the Egret model. He believes that if there is to be any change to the code that it should allow second floor modifications without changing footprints or setbacks. Changing setbacks to accommodate one model in one village doesn't seem to be an effective way to do business. What model would be next?

James Algert, Coronado Cays resident and prior member of the Architectural Control Committee for 15 years, explained that until 1995 and especially in the early 1970s, the second stories of the villages were sacrosanct in many ways and they seldom allowed anything to happen up there. They certainly would not have thought of a change such as is being proposed. He urged, very strongly, that the City Council really consider this as those setbacks were there for a reason. The architecture is there for a reason. The views, open air space are very important for those villages as is the overall density. This is a Special Use Permit for restricted development that was very carefully crafted in many ways.

Ned Floyd, 10 Jamaica Village, lives in a town house. He discussed the density issue. The Cays' amenities will be overburdened. Right now there are restrictions on how many people each home can take to the pool. Parking is allocated at ½ space per unit. Additional bedrooms will overstrain that. He pointed out that the CC&Rs, Article 20, is very explicit that in the case of damage and rebuilding, it has to be done to the original specifications. They did not say preexisting, but original, and there is good reason for that. He pointed out a correction that needs to be made to the map of Jamaica Village regarding the type of dwellings.

Kim Corbess, 4 The Inlet, Bahama Village, is in favor of expansion on the second floor. This will not expand their bedrooms and increase density, but rather will expand their living quarters. Society has changed since this development was built. She understands that there are still things that need to be clarified and thinks that some decisions made in the Architectural Committee may not have been made properly. She looks to the City Council for guidance and help in this issue.

Gloria LeBlanc, 17 Aruba, Port Royale, owner of a Marquis unit, is pleased with some of the changes that are occurring, however, she is appalled at the photo she saw of the Egret unit where someone's backyard now has someone looking in.

David Shepard, 35 Aruba Bend, Port Royale, explained that the notice he received for this meeting states that the amendments correct typographical errors and clarify current policy. No change in policy is proposed. Then, on the reverse side, a change in policy is proposed in Section C. How anyone could conclude otherwise is beyond him. He suggested that the typographical errors be corrected and the text, otherwise, be left unchanged. Any changes beyond that, even if alleged to be clarification, should be voted on by the members of the Coronado Cays Villages affected. The CCHOA Board may have approved of the proposed policy change but it should not be permitted to make decisions over the objections of the residents of the villages affected. He is not against homeowners making additions or other improvements that are not objected to by the neighbors affected. However, when such changes are proposed, the City should require that approval in writing from the neighbors affected be obtained in writing before permitting. The City, not the CCHOA, should then make judgment, if

the permission is not obtained, and the party who wishes to make the addition contends the view or the privacy of the neighbor is not affected. There is no reason why this common policy in the United States could not be applicable to residents of Coronado Cays.

Karen Wood, 9 and 6 Half Moon Bend, stressed Ms. Downey's comment that the proposal before the City is not changing the right to add a second story to anyone who already didn't have it. She is in favor of the proposal and she has faith in the Architectural Committee which considers such issues as whether the neighbors are affected and whether the neighbors can work something out. Specifically, with regard to second story additions that do not change the setbacks or footprint, she sees no reason not to allow those. There are plenty of examples in the Cays of those having been allowed. She is against any blanket proposal to prohibit second story additions without going to the Architectural Committee, considering the neighbors and she feels that the proposal before the City is appropriate.

Candace Serstead Eckel, 2 The Inlet, explained that if her neighbor in the Egret model were to build an expansion on her living room, it would block all views of the ocean from her deck that was approved in the initial plans. It would move a lot of activity right next to the upstairs bedroom. These conditions existed when newer people bought these properties. For them to just decide that changes should be made because they aren't content with what they bought into is really not a reasonable reason to change the existing homeowner requirements.

Tracy Stickel, lives at 50 Blue Anchor Cay and owns 2 Bridgetown Bend (an Egret model), agreed with Karen Wood and Ms. Downey that there is no change that was not already previously approved. She addressed being an owner of an Egret model. She loves Coronado and sees everyone in town enjoying what Coronado has to offer. She wants to be a good neighbor. She enjoys improving her home and she wants to do so according to the rules. She has been on the CCHOA Board and believes they have done that in the course of improvements they have done on properties they have owned. They have always been rule followers and property improvers. They add on in ways that are respectful. They understand light and visibility and privacy. The bit that is being proposed in the Egret model has no impact on any neighbor's light, privacy or view corridor. She pointed out that the exhibit photo is not an Egret model as some people may have believed.

Vernon Fry, 25 St. Christopher's Lane, referred to Councilmember Tanaka's question as to what motivated him and what his bottom line was. In 2002, a neighbor built a second story addition which totally destroyed the privacy that was there when he purchased the home in 1998. He protested vigorously at the time to no avail. After becoming aware of the Specific Plan in 2006 he duly noted the prohibition regarding remodeling on the second floor. The very people who should have protected his planned community rights were working against him. No apologies were offered; only limp excuses and passing the blame back and forth between the City and the HOA. The more he has researched and learned, the more involved he has become. His motivation and bottom line is to help prevent prohibited second story building from destroying the privacy of other homeowners in this planned community. He has no other motivation. He made it clear that this is not a Proposition J individual property rights issue, but a four different planned communities issue. No one cares however a home is built or remodeled in the middle of 20 acres. But in a densely packed, planned community, such as the Coronado Cays, remodeling plans of a homeowner can seriously impact the quality of life for an adjacent neighbor. He said that Councilmember Tanaka stated it very well when he said that it was not an accident that it required a 51% vote from the homeowners to bring about change as this requirement provided

stability and protection for the planned community. Boards of Directors come and go and the goals and agendas may differ from succeeding boards, but the planned community lives on. Change can occur, but it should only occur by subjecting the proposed change to the will of the homeowners within the planned community as set forth in the governing documents. Since the change from the Special Use Permit to the Coronado Cays Specific Plan has taken place, the power to make decisions has been transferred from the homeowners to the City Council. Even though the City Council has the power to do so, it should think long and hard about bringing about the change being proposed to the planned community of the Coronado Cays. Ignoring the protection that existed before the Specific Plan threatens the very core to the existence of this or any planned community. The picture about a huge house overlooking a back yard is his house.

Ella Croshier, 25 Blue Anchor Cay, commented that the agenda says nothing about second stories, which seems to be the major topic on this issue. She thought it might be a good idea to add it to the agenda in the future. Also, with respect to notification, from the onset of this item this has changed considerably. This is not about the Egret model. It never has been. It is about making the Coronado Cays open to major construction changes. That is the bottom line. Everyone here is aware of that. She has not heard or seen any supportive evidence to substantiate statements made by Tony Pena, Bud Webb, and Peter Fait that only on the first floor means second story is okay and second stories have always been allowed. There has been no evidence – only their statements. Whether with intent or disregard of the rules, the City and the Coronado Cays AECC approved construction changes that were not allowed in the governing documents or the Specific Plan. The language is not ambiguous in either of these documents. The City Council has been put in a position to legitimize the mistakes made by others. Not only is the City Council being asked to provide cover up for the past mistakes, but it is also being asked to make a new rule allowing for a major land use change in an attractive planned community. She said this is not about Mr. Foley wanting to add a second story to his home nor is the Egret model disadvantaged. How can it be disadvantaged when second story modifications are prohibited? It is not about clarifying the language in the Specific Plan. Doesn't this seem strange that, in response to one homeowner's request that such a far reaching and massive change in land use is put in motion? Think about that. Ms. Sarguetti addressed Mr. Monroe's comments. She reviewed the minutes of that last meeting carefully and she believes she stated accurately what his statements were with regard to the history behind what is happening today. Mr. Monroe has been involved in this from the very beginning and he is knowledgeable and he knows the full intent of what the Specific Plan states today and what this change will do for tomorrow if it is adopted. She urged the City Council not to adopt this proposed rule change. A vote of the community has not been completed.

Mrs. Sarguetti, Jamaica Village, is saddened by this situation. She feels that this virus started in Port Royale and has spread through Bahama, Jamaica, and she is unsure about Trinidad. If the City Council passes this, it will open a can of worms pitting one neighbor against another. She doesn't want to see that.

Lou Miliotti, 30 St. Christopher Lane, made his comments using a PowerPoint presentation. He was allowed to use his 3 minutes and 3 minutes donated by Laila Frye of 25 St. Christopher Lane. At this time it is generally understood by homeowners that the Specific Plan does not allow second story additions and modifications in the four villages Port Royale, Trinidad, Bahama and Jamaica. The Notice of Public Hearing received in the mail is misleading in that it indicates "Except for the proposed amendment for the "Egret" model, the amendments correct typographical errors and clarify current policy – no change of policy is proposed." This is a

misleading statement in that the proposed change is a major change of policy as they know it. Additionally the notice does not indicate the hearing involves Port Royale, Trinidad, Bahama and Jamaica, which it does. His research into the history that Mayor Smisek and the City Council brought out some documentation. CCHOA Resolution 01-01 is a resolution that the HOA sent to the City as the SUP was being changed to the Specific Plan. It reads, "...the Special Use Permit...limits zero lot line construction to the original developer and this restriction makes it very difficult for homeowners to design any additions to zero lot line homes." That makes sense because the SUP was between the developer and the City. They are the ones who constructed the homes. To be able to make additions, the homeowners' requested that the following be inserted: "...any modification, addition...may be expanded only on the first floor and only within a rectangular area formed by the projection of the outermost exterior walls of the home as constructed by the original developer." What that meant is that homeowners could only fill in the holes on the first floor. It is signed by Larry Peterson. He thinks that it is interesting that the one person who could provide insight as to the true intent of this resolution has remained silent during these hearings. Mr. Miliotti went on to a letter Larry Peterson sent out to homeowners when Mr. Foley put in his petition to add a second story over the bedroom that was signed by 23 people. The letter says that this plan was amended in December 2001. It wasn't amended – that is when the SUP became the Specific Plan. The result was that all second story modifications were prohibited for detached homes in Port Royale. Though second story changes were prohibited, second story modifications were routinely approved by the AECC. The next piece of documentation was a letter from Bud Webb to Tony Pena and Larry Peterson that was in the staff report for the 28 November Planning Commission meeting. It stated, "When it was brought to the attention of the AECC in 2004 that the wording literally said that any addition to a home which used the special side yard could be expanded on the first floor only, the committee felt compelled to deny requests for second floor additions." Mr. Miliotti pointed out that is different than what Mr. Pena told Ms. Downey at the 20 February meeting. He showed a letter from Bob Kranz, the General Manager of the CCHOA, to City Manager Mark Ochendusko. This letter is from when the City was talking about changing from the SUP to the Specific Plan. It reads, "Attached is a resolution approved by the Association Board of Directors regarding the expansion of zero lot line houses. This issue has been discussed at several Board of Directors' meetings. The intent is to allow zero lot line homes to be expanded only on the ground floor only. The Board does not want to allow second story additions because the inevitable effect that such expansions would have on the neighbors." That clears up the intent of the resolution and the change when the City went from the SUP to the Specific Plan regarding building expansion. Mr. Miliotti next showed a document he signed when he bought his home in 1998. It says that home buyers should, "...give careful thought to whether you will be able to exist happily in an atmosphere of cooperative living where the interests of the group must be taken into account as well as the interests of the individual." Now the group is not being asked what it wants. The City Council is acting on a petition that one person put in that was signed by 23 people. He offered the City Council the opportunity to review his summary slide.

Frank Tobin, attorney for Vernon Fry, 530 D Street #2100, San Diego, explained that Dr. Fry owns 25 St. Christopher's Way in Port Royale. Mr. Tobin explained that the record indicates that the change proposed is allowing second story modifications where they have not been allowed in the past. He commented on the staff report's paragraph regarding CEQA. First of all it says that the General Rule exemption applies. It also says that any additions or constructions of single family dwellings as a result of the amendment are further exempt under 15301 and 15303. Under the CEQA guidelines, a project is taken as a whole of an action which has the potential for resulting either in a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonable

foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. This means that an agency such as the City cannot avoid CEQA review by piece mealing a project into smaller projects. By citing those two sections, 15301 and 15303, there is piece mealing and that is not going to cause what is being proposed to be exempt. Really what is at issue is the general rule exemption. The issue here is whether the effect of amending the Specific Plan in the manner proposed, allowing second story modifications in what amounts to several hundred homes in four villages and what the impacts will be. If the City allows second story expansions there will be more residents, more traffic, aesthetic impacts, cultural value impacts, noise, construction noise, light issues, privacy issues, air issues, fire, safety, etc. In order to have the General Rule exemption it can only apply if it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant affect on the environment. Given all of these issues and potential impacts the City cannot say with certainty that there is no possibility that what is proposed will not have a significant affect on the environment. Therefore, the amendment that is being proposed, he submits, requires a proper CEQA review. In addition, the Coastal Commission is not referenced by the staff report. There is no reference as to whether the Coastal Commission program has to be changed or whether homeowners are going to have to request changes if they are doing second story modifications within the Coastal program. That should be addressed. Finally, Mr. Tobin stated that he thinks the authority of the Board is at issue. He agrees with the City Attorney's comments from the last hearing that the Board has standing to bring this request and they are treated like any other citizen in connection with bringing the request. The issue of whether they have authority is one amongst the HOA. The issue of authority of the Board is still relevant for the City Council's consideration. Article 3, Paragraph 8 of the Declaration gives the Board authority to adopt rules and regulations with regard to the use and occupancy of common areas, not the individual lots. The Board should not be advocating for major changes in areas other than the common area that they cannot otherwise enact in disrupting the status quo when there is no evidence that the majority of the homeowners are for it. In point of fact, Mr. Shriver came before the City Council and stated that he changed his mind and is no longer in favor of this because he understands that there is not a majority of the people in his village who are for this. The lack of authority and the lack of homeowner support for this major change is very relevant. For all of these reasons, the status quo should be left intact and the request should be denied.

Lisa Brent, 15 St. Christopher's Lane, noted that there are a lot of people who are in favor of the proposed changes and many of them aren't speaking because they feel that City staff is doing its job. She hopes that the City Council will support its staff in the clarifications they are proposing.

Joe Epstein, CCHOA legal counsel, advised that he was available to answer any questions the City Council might have of him.

Bill Maxim, 24 Catspaw Cape, and who owns other properties in Coronado, is particularly concerned about the proposal. For him, to yield to 45 houses out of 1200 is equivalent to spot zoning. Back in the '50s and '60s when SUPs were developed for similar situations to allow larger tracts of land to be developed in a more dense manner than others, those plans were put into effect to allow the developers to then come in with their CC&Rs. This amounts to a few Egret owners who are not happy with having to get 601 votes of owners from the Coronado Cays. They got the ear of the current Board of Directors who brought this to the City Council to have it worked on. He disagrees with that. He knew what he was buying in the Cays. He wanted consistency. He did not want second stories on either side of his house. He did not want people building over their garages, which he believes is prohibited. He is confused when he

hears Mr. Pena say that prohibiting second stories was never the intent. He suggested that the City Council restudy this to make sure that no changes are being made. He is particularly concerned because if this spot zoning becomes a precedent, who knows what will come next. He thinks that this should at least be sent back for further study. The Cays homeowners are not for allowing additional additions.

Mayor Smisek closed the public hearing.

Mayor Smisek asked Mr. Pena to address the letters introduced during public testimony.

Mr. Pena clarified that Larry Peterson's predecessor was Bob Kranz and the letter was about four years prior to the adoption of the Specific Plan. There was some urgency on the CCHOA part to transfer from the SUP to the Specific Plan. The City started receiving letters to motivate it such as this letter from Bob Kranz. After about a four year period the Specific Plan came about and there was a weekly communication between the CCHOA and the City with Bob Kranz primarily representing the HOA. When the Specific Plan was in final draft form there was ample opportunity for the HOA to make changes or suggestions or to indicate where the Plan was not implementing their intent. There were numerous hearings on this and staff felt that, at the time it was adopted by the City Council, the Plan did implement all of the then current policies of the HOA. It would have been very easy, for example, to look at the Kranz letter and the language in the Specific Plan, to say that specifically no second stories are allowed and that first stories can be added on to only within certain specific parameters. There was no mention of a prohibition on second stories in the Specific Plan. That is what staff found in reviewing this and that was the report to the City Council. Some comments made about restrictions only to the first story came out of only one paragraph, special side yard provisions of the Specific Plan, without reading other provisions that allow additions to be made within the overall parameters of the standards. For example, some of those parameters include two stories and 35', the setbacks, 800 sq. ft. minimum rear yard has to be maintained if you develop an L or a wing into the rear yard. There are provisions of that nature where it allows for additions and second stories. One of the standards is a 55% maximum structural coverage for the first story. It doesn't mention the second stories that are also allowed by the Code as long as you don't exceed 35'. He thinks that there is some confusion about how the City implemented the policy. He thinks that what was adopted is pretty precise in not prohibiting second stories.

Mayor Smisek recalled that the Council asked for clarification to write down what the policy and practice have been. By virtue of that being done it makes it much clearer now. He wondered, when he listened to the testimony, what was the original intent and then the letters show that it would have been very clear in the Specific Plan that you could not do any of this work on the second story if that was what was intended by the City Council when they passed the Specific Plan. The intent must not have been there. One question people have brought up concern privacy and views. This is always something that comes up. The City has tried to protect views and privacy as much as possible, but it is not something that legally has to be done. Protection of views is a very touchy subject as it is in most seaside communities, but it doesn't have much standing in the courts.

Councilmember Tanaka asked if the Specific Plan is silent on the issue of second story additions. Mr. Pena responded that if there is no specific prohibition on second stories so then you go back to the overall standards that apply to any particular area – in this case, a village residence is two stories and 35'.

Peter Fait, Associate Planner, provided the municipal code section. It comes from 90.10.080, which says that the maximum building height shall not exceed two stories or 35'.

Councilmember Ovrom referred to the Specific Plan. It does say, in 90.10.100, the last sentence in Section C, that any modification, addition, construction, or replacement of a home constructed utilizing a special side yard may be expanded only on the first floor and only within the rectangular area formed by the projection of the outermost walls of the home as constructed by the original developer. When Mr. Ovrom looked at the proposed modifications, C3 changes that. It says that the second floor can be changed. Mr. Pena agreed. Mr. Fait elaborated on that Section C is titled 'Special Side Yard.' It is a separate regulation to build within that special side yard along the zero setback. That is what it was intended to regulate. If you were to build off of the zero setback and provide a normal, say 5', setback, you wouldn't be restricted or governed by Subsection C. That has always been part of the guidelines that the City has interpreted and applied and issued permits accordingly. Also, he added for a bit of history, the language that was read earlier regarding the first story within a rectangular area came about in 2001 partly from homeowners who wanted to add on. Many of the zero lot line homes have small patios or cutouts in the center of the building, away from the zero setback, or portions on their corners that were not built to the zero setback. They came to the City and to HOA to request filling that in. Staff told them that the code wasn't clear and that is one thing that led to the amendment in 2001. People wanted direction on what and where they could build and add on or complete or fill in along the zero setback. It was never intended to regulate other portions of the first floor outside of that setback or on the second story.

Mr. Ovrom feels that may have been the intent but when he reads it he doesn't see them that way.

Councilmember Downey wants to know what the understanding is regarding second stories. Every time she has asked that question she has been told that it was the intent of the plan to allow second stories and that is how it has been interpreted by the HOA and City staff. Therefore, the wording that she and Mr. Pena discussed was just to clarify that. Now, she thinks there might be a different question. Now the question is whether that assumption was correct. Was there an understanding that second stories were allowed on these models already? The people who spoke seemed to have a different understanding. She thinks that Mayor Smisek was correct in saying that whatever the City Council voted on in 2001 when the last adoption was done, that is what the law is. She is a little concerned. She thinks that, since this doesn't restrict it and it talks about the maximum building height being 35' and two stories, that it was indeed being allowed. She also understands that there are a lot of people in the Cays who didn't think that it was ever being allowed. The correspondence is interesting, but it doesn't have anything to do with what the City Council actually adopted. Is there any chance of getting the minutes from the meeting to clarify? She thinks that the only way to see what was done would be to see if it was addressed at all. If it wasn't addressed, then the answer is that it didn't restrict it. It does not restrict second stories and she is sorry to the people who didn't know that second stories were being allowed. The rule of interpretation is that if it doesn't restrict it and it can be legally interpreted to do it, then it would be allowed. She does not know if that was the intention of the City Council.

Mayor Smisek proposed another option. One is to simply address the Egret model and not the clean up discussion for the rest of the Specific Plan. If the intent is not to allow it for the Egret,

then the whole thing can be denied. Because of the questions about verbage he would entertain the idea of separating the two and have it go back for another look and another notification because it does clarify for more than the one village. Because the vote that was taken was in one village and because the vote was relative to the Egret model only, he feels most comfortable in addressing the Egret model and not the rest of it at this point and it can come back if the HOA so desires.

Ms. Downey is comfortable that the City had addressed the Egret model and that she could move forward with that part. She agrees with Mayor Smisek that it is the HOA Board's responsibility to comply with their regulations in terms of notification and she would use the opportunity to tell all the homeowners that they have her deepest sympathy. She encouraged them to continue to get involved.

Mr. Tanaka likes Mayor Smisek's suggestion. To him, it sounds like the unfortunate reality is that the Specific Plan did not protect the Cays homeowners to the extent that their CC&Rs did, or to the extent that their expectations did. He thinks that there are a number of people who believe that second story expansion was, if not banned, limited to an extent and that is why that documentation came up. If he lived in the Cays he would be baffled, too, to have communications from a Board, the Board president, all expressing that the Board did not want this policy and then find out that the Specific Plan that they supported allows it. He doesn't believe his job is to second guess it. He has to look at what the law is on the books. He hates to say that he thinks the law on the books allows for that second story expansion because of the, as Mr. Fait mentioned, 35' two story. It doesn't spell out that building on that second story cannot be completed. To him, the issue before the City Council is the Egret model and whether or not to move into the 10' setback. He doesn't think that is the appropriate policy. He believes it is a 10' setback for a reason. The questions he comes back to are why this is being done and if it is really necessary. He doesn't think it meets that threshold for him. In Mr. Tanaka's view, this issue is the same issue that has faced the village of Coronado for quite a while: overdevelopment. This is really just a move to expand these homes and he doesn't think that sort of expansion was envisioned with the types of regulations that were already in place. This change is not consistent with the spirit of what the planned community is, what the restrictions were and ideally, when they first created the SUP, it created a mechanism for the 50% + 1. He thinks that is the way this sort of a change should come about, not by a vote of the City Council.

Mayor Smisek explained that, because the write-up is not set without those changes, this will go back to staff with the direction to eliminate the clarifications and to put in the changes for the Egret model and bring that back for a First Reading. The other portion will be referred back to the HOA for discussion.

MSC (Downey/Ovrom) moved that the City Council direct staff to bring back an amendment for Egret models only

AYES:	Downey, Ovrom, and Smisek
NAYS:	Tanaka
ABSENT:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	Monroe

Councilmember Monroe and City Manager Mark Ochendusko returned to the dais.

9. **ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS:** None.

10. **COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

10a. **Report from the Port Commissioner Concerning Port Activities.** No report.

11. **CITY COUNCIL BUSINESS:**

11a. **Council Reports on Inter-Agency Committee and Board Assignments.**

Councilmember Monroe attended an MTS Board meeting, where they worked on finance meetings, attended a FACT meeting in Oceanside, and was invited to be AT&T's guest at the San Diego Fire Rescue Foundation fundraising lunch. He also attended the SANDAG Transportation meeting and the Navy Complexes meeting.

Councilmember Tanaka had nothing to report.

Councilmember Ovrom attended a meeting of the Tunnel Action Team, traveled to Washington, D. C. with Mayor Smisek, attended the 75th Anniversary of the VFW, and a Public Utilities Advisory Commission meeting.

Councilmember Downey attended the Coronado Women's Club 60th Anniversary Annual meeting, several League of California Cities meetings – the League of Coastal Cities Issues Group meeting and the League of California Cities Subcommittee on Legislative Affairs meeting with Senior Management Analyst Andrew Potter. She attended the City Selection Committee for the re-nomination to the Coastal Commission, chaired the SANDAG Environmental Mitigation Program Committee meeting, and attended the Coronado Peacemaker Awards.

Mayor Smisek went to Washington, D.C., attended a Library Board meeting, a Tunnel Action Team meeting, the 75th Anniversary of the VFW Post and Golf Tournament, the Navy Complexes meeting at which Admiral Hering was in attendance, and met with Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy Wayne Army.

11b. **Consideration of Appointment of One New Member to the Coronado Library Board of Trustees.** Mayor Smisek explained the methodology used when voting for commission appointments when there is more than one applicant.

Robin Frank, 317 Fifth Street, introduced herself to the City Council and provided some background information on her qualifications.

Sally Ann Zoll, 550 Alameda, introduced herself to the City Council and provided some background information on her qualifications.

After two rounds of voting, Sally Ann Zoll had the most positive votes.

MSUC (Smisek/Ovrom) moved that the City Council appoint Sally Ann Zoll to a term on the Coronado Library Board of Trustees to a term to expire August 31, 2009.

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

11c. Review of Report and Comment Regarding Potential Homeporting and Associated Traffic Impacts of Third Naval Nuclear Aircraft Carrier at Naval Air Station North Island (NASNI). Mayor Smisek instructed the audience on the issue. In 1999 the City went through the process of the EIR/EIS, which are the federal and state environmental studies, on the possibility of three nuclear carriers being homeported in the City of Coronado. At the completion of that, which was a very extensive process with lots of assistance from the Navy and the Nuclear Power program, it was passed by the City Council 5-0 in support of the three carrier homeporting. Since that there have been two carriers in Coronado. This is the discussion of a third carrier coming to Coronado. The decision will probably be made, by the Secretary of the Navy, in approximately May. The City was interested in two things on this. The first is the progress on the mitigation of traffic and the assurance that the Navy and Federal Highways and the partnership with Caltrans, SANDAG, Coronado and the Navy would continue to work towards the mitigation of the problem. There is competition from Washington State to get the third carrier. There have been local meetings to discuss this and Mayor Smisek went with Councilmember Ovrom to Washington, D.C. on this issue. In Washington, D.C. they met with officials from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy's office, Mr. Buddy Penn, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations, and Mr. Wayne Arne, his deputy. They also met with Vice Admiral Conway and Asst. Secretary Penn. In addition, they met with the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Mullens. They talked with Senator Boxer's and Senator Feinstein's staffs as well as Congresswoman Susan Davis to go over the whole process to solicit support for Coronado's attempt to find a solution to the traffic problem in Coronado. Their objective at the time was to verify the plan of action, to continue that process and to ultimately come up with a solution that is feasible. Costs in the construction business are escalating very rapidly. Mr. Arne hand delivered a letter to the City today from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy. The intent of this letter is to reinforce that the Navy is going to be working with the City of Coronado, with the region, and they are actually going to expand their horizon a little bit. Coronado has been working towards the Coronado solution, but there are bigger and better things occurring that have to do with the military personnel working at not only Coronado's bases but at others. There are some things that need to be addressed besides the major project that is on the table to try to alleviate the problem by either having more barracks on base and other types of things that will help. The Navy wants to expand that study. The Navy has reinforced their commitment to work with the City not only on the big picture but also on some of the smaller picture items. He read the letter for the public.

Dear Mayor Smisek:

I appreciated the opportunity to meet with you and Councilman Ovrom to discuss the status of the SR75/282 Transportation Corridor Project. Those types of discussions allow us to maintain the close ties and foster the mutual support the City of Coronado and the Navy have shared for so long.

We share your deep commitment to find ways to relieve current and forecasted travel congestion in Coronado. As we discussed, careful consideration of alternatives is important to ensure that viable, affordable traffic improvements can be made that properly address anti-terrorism/force protection concerns for the Sailors and government employees who work at Naval Base Coronado.

The Navy will continue to support comprehensive analyses of traffic volume and flow in an effort to assist the City, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), the California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS), and the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) in identifying feasible, cost effective remedies. We will further commit to provide funding to support such analyses consistent with our role as Cooperating Agency. We are prepared to fully participate in the evaluation of potential designs. Once mutually acceptable traffic improvements are determined, we will help identify appropriate funding sources for subsequent phases of the process.

Rear Admiral Len Hering, Commander, Navy Region Southwest (CNRSW), remains the Navy's local point of contact on this issue. I am confident that the talented and dedicated employees of the City of Coronado, SANDAG, CALTRANS, FHWA, and CNRSW will find the right regional approach to this multifaceted transportation problem that enables the City and the Navy to achieve our respective goals and missions.

Thank you for your city's longstanding support of the U.S. Navy in Coronado. The Navy-City of Coronado relationship is a special one that is important to the Navy and to me personally. I look forward to the progress we will make working together on this challenge.

Sincerely,
BJ Penn

Mayor Smisek added that the City asked for dedication and recommitment in writing from the Navy so that it could be shared with the City Council and the public. He thinks that the City Council should direct the City Manager to come back at the next meeting with a position of support for the homeporting of the third carrier in Coronado.

Councilmember Ovrom thanked Mayor Smisek for his consistent portrayal of the problems that traffic causes in Coronado. He and Mayor Smisek were in Washington to ensure that they were clear on what was going on and to ensure that they were aware of what the City is interested in, which is continued support. He had concerns about waning support from the Navy, but was very pleased with what he heard in Washington.

Mayor Smisek thanked several citizens for their assistance and support. He thanked Admiral Edney, the San Diego Military Affairs (SD MAC) group, the Tunnel Action Team, and the City's lobbyist in Washington.

Councilmember Downey thanked Mayor Smisek and Mr. Ovrom for their efforts on this.

Councilmember Monroe also thanked and congratulated everyone.

Councilmember Tanaka added his thanks.

Mr. Ovrom thanked Mike Woiwode and the SD MAC group for putting together the times for Mr. Ochenduszko to present Coronado's side of the problem.

A member of the audience asked if some pros and cons of the issue could be described.

Mayor Smisek addressed the homeporting aspect. The three carrier concept was investigated in 1999 quite extensively. The City of Coronado does not receive a lot of economic benefit from this. The City does have the benefit of working with the people this brings to Coronado. The downside is that the City gets the traffic. San Diego gets the big economic benefit because most of the people live and shop in San Diego.

Admiral John Nyquist, 685 Margarita Avenue, provided some historical statistics. He thinks it is helpful to place the potential impact of a third nuclear carrier at North Island in historical context. Since the San Diego/Coronado Bay Bridge opened in 1969 there have been three carriers homeported at North Island for 24 of those 38 years. Since 1987 North Island has been the homeport for three carriers for 10 of those years, including 4 of the last 7. On average, there are only 13 days per year when all three homeported carriers were pier side at the same time. It should also be noted that the older, conventional carriers carried about 3,000 sailors and ships' company compared to today's modern, nuclear powered carrier which is manned with about 10% fewer personnel. That adds up to about 900 fewer sailors in those ships than in their predecessors. Taking a look at the shore side, since its peak population of 9,800 in the mid '70s, manpower at the Naval Air Depot has declined to its current level of about 3,500. The phasing out of the S3 Viking aircraft, six fleet squadrons of 220 personnel per squadron have been decommissioned along with the Fleet Replacement Squadron. Finally, the total military population at the Air Station, which peaked in 1996, had declined by nearly 3,000. North Island Air Station was commissioned in 1917 and was the homeport to the Navy's first carrier, USS LANGLEY. By 1935 the Air Station was homeport to all four carriers in the US Navy, LANGLEY, LEXINGTON, SARATOGA and RANGER. In 1963 the House Armed Services Committee passed a resolution officially recognizing North Island Naval Air Station as the Birthplace of Naval Aviation. He strongly recommends and urges the City Council to continue the unbroken bond between Coronado and the Navy and support the homeporting of a third carrier at North Island if that is the Navy's decision.

Admiral Ed Martin, 729 Guadalupe, expressed his appreciation for the efforts of the City and the City Council for trying to move this onto the front burner. The Navy has had three aircraft carriers in Coronado for many years. When he arrived in 1955 there were five aircraft carriers there. The Navy designed the nuclear power facility at North Island to accommodate three carriers. What their decision will be is up to the Navy. It is up to the people of Coronado to try to be good stewards of the Navy's will and to try to continue to mitigate the traffic problem in Coronado by whatever means possible, but most importantly, that they try to keep the issue of identifying means, requirements and a source of funding to make this happen. There are a number of people present who are willing to help in any way possible.

Councilmember Monroe brought up the summer of 2001 when there were three carriers for over 60 days and four at a time over two weekends.

Councilmember Downey thanked the speakers and offered some comments on the numbers given. Coronado has a chance to do something to work together with the Navy and to continue to welcome the Navy.

Mayor Smisek commented that some short term solutions are being developed as well.

MSUC (Smisek/Downey) moved that the City Council receive the report and direct the City Manager to come back with a motion for support of a third carrier homeporting in Coronado.

AYES: Downey, Monroe, Ovrom, Tanaka and Smisek
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None

12. **CITY ATTORNEY:** No report.

13. **COMMUNICATIONS - WRITTEN:** None.

The City Council recessed to hold the CDA meeting at 5:49 p.m. The Council resumed the meeting for oral communications regarding closed session items at 6:30 p.m.

Peter Fagan, 379 F Avenue, addressed the closed session items regarding negotiations with the Police and Fire Associations.

The City Council recessed to closed session at 6:32 p.m.

14. **CLOSED SESSION:**

a. CLOSED SESSION – CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

AUTHORITY: Government Code §54957.6
CITY NEGOTIATORS: Mark Ochendusko, City Manager; Leslie Suelter, Director of Administrative Services; Jim Benson, Assistant City Manager.
EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION: Coronado Police Officers' Association (CPOA)

b. CLOSED SESSION – CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

AUTHORITY: Government Code §54957.6
CITY NEGOTIATORS: Mark Ochendusko, City Manager; Leslie Suelter, Director of Administrative Services; Jim Benson, Assistant City Manager.
EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATION: Coronado Firefighters' Association (CFA)

- c. **CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL
EXISTING LITIGATION**
AUTHORITY: Government Code §54956.9(a)
NAME OF CASE: Workers' Compensation Appeals Board Case Number:
 TBD
 Mark Fagan
- d. **CLOSED SESSION: CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL
EXISTING LITIGATION**
AUTHORITY: Government Code Section 54956.9(a)
NAME OF CASE: Coronado Cays Homeowners Association v. City of
 Coronado
 Case No. GIC 872917

The Regular Meeting resumed at 7:47 p.m.

The Deputy City Attorney announced that on Items 14a and 14b direction was given to the City's negotiator, and on Item 14c and 14d counsel was given direction by the City Council.

15. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Approved: April 3, 2007

Tom Smisek, Mayor
City of Coronado

Attest:

Linda K. Hascup
City Clerk